

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION**

KASSANDRA JACKSON,  
Plaintiff,

vs.

MICHAEL BACHMAN, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 1:19-cv-422  
Dlott, J.  
Litkovitz, M.J.

**REPORT AND  
RECOMMENDATION**

Plaintiff, a resident of Cincinnati, Ohio, initiated this pro se civil rights action in June 2019 against former Hamilton County Magistrate Michael Bachman and others.<sup>1</sup> In September 2019, defendant Bachman filed a motion to dismiss for insufficient service of process, representing that he does not reside at the Hamilton County Courthouse, nor has he worked there since September 2018. (Doc. 9). Thereafter, the Court granted plaintiff's motion to serve defendant Bachman at his home address. (Doc. 13). On April 3, 2020, the Court ordered the U.S. Marshal to serve defendant Bachman with copies of the complaint, summons form, and the Court's June 2019 Order and Report and Recommendation at his home address as directed by plaintiff. (Doc. 15).

On June 1, 2020, defendant Bachman filed a renewed motion to dismiss under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6). (Doc. 17). The renewed motion to dismiss no longer mentions that defendant Bachman has not been properly served. Accordingly, it is **RECOMMENDED** that defendant Bachman's motion to dismiss for insufficient service of process (Doc. 9) be **DENIED** as **MOOT**.

Date: June 2, 2020

  
Karen L. Litkovitz  
United States Magistrate Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff's claims against all other defendants have been dismissed. (Docs. 4, 8).

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION**

KASSANDRA JACKSON,  
Plaintiff,

Case No. 1:19-cv-422  
Dlott, J.  
Litkovitz, M.J.

vs.

MICHAEL BACHMAN, et al.,  
Defendants.

**NOTICE**

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), **WITHIN 14 DAYS** after being served with a copy of the recommended disposition, a party may serve and file specific written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations. This period may be extended further by the Court on timely motion for an extension. Such objections shall specify the portions of the Report objected to and shall be accompanied by a memorandum of law in support of the objections. If the Report and Recommendation is based in whole or in part upon matters occurring on the record at an oral hearing, the objecting party shall promptly arrange for the transcription of the record, or such portions of it as all parties may agree upon, or the Magistrate Judge deems sufficient, unless the assigned District Judge otherwise directs. A party may respond to another party's objections **WITHIN 14 DAYS** after being served with a copy thereof. Failure to make objections in accordance with this procedure may forfeit rights on appeal. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981).